

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 11-20, 23-36, 47-56, and 59-72 are currently pending the application, with claims 11, 12, 13, 16, 23, 30, 47, 48, 49, 52, 59, and 66 being the independent claims. Claims 11, 47-51, and 59-72 stand rejected, with claims 12-20, 23-36, and 52-56 being allowed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 47-50, 59-61, 65-68, and 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yablon's U.S. Patent 5,764,731 ("Yablon"). This rejection includes independent claims 47, 48, 49, 59, and 66. In view of the arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection cannot properly be maintained.

In general, Yablon is concerned with the problem of making telephone numbers available to a telephone user who may be at a variety of locations and who may find it inconvenient to manually collect, maintain, and use a list of such numbers. *See* Yablon, col. 4, line 23 - col. 10, line 40. While Yablon is concerned with making telephone numbers available for use, it is not generally concerned with the form that those numbers must take in order to be used. Rather, Yablon essentially allows users to download stored telephone numbers from a remote location. *See* Yablon, col. 10, lines 10-15.

On the other hand, independent claims 47, 48, 49, 59, and 66 require, among other things, that a phone number or list of phone numbers be produced *in response to* called party information. This concept is described, for example, in the application as initially filed at page 16 lines 3-13. *See also* page 21, line 18 - page 22, line 5. Thus, "called party information" (such as the four-digit subscriber number portion of a conventional phone number) may be used to produce properly formed telephone numbers that correspond to that called party information. An example of this is found at page 21, line 18 - page 22, line 5 of the application as initially filed. There is described an embodiment in which called party information (i.e., the number 780-9999), along with other information, is used to formulate the actual number needed to complete the call -- 207-780-9999.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Yablon does not contain any disclosure of "called party information" or producing a telephone number or list of telephone numbers *in response to* called party information as claimed herein. While Yablon describes downloading telephone numbers from a remote location, this downloading is not *in response to* called party information. Thus, for example, there is no way in which any information regarding the "called party" plays any role in the phone number or numbers downloaded.

Similarly, independent claims 47, 48, 49, 59, and 66 also generally require receiving called party information. As described above, Yablon does not describe receiving "called party information" as used herein. Called party information is information received from the calling party, which contains some information regarding the called party, such as a portion of that party's complete phone number. *See* page 10, lines 12-13 of the application as initially filed. In Yablon, on the other hand, the user is contacting some remote location, such as directory assistance, and downloading telephone numbers. There is no receipt of called party information as properly understood in the context of this application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yablon cannot anticipate claims 47, 48, 49, 59, and 66, or the more narrow claims depending therefrom.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 51, 62-64, and 69-71 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yablon in view of Walsh et al.'s U.S. Patent 5,655,015 ("Walsh"). This rejection includes the remaining independent claim -- claim 11.

Similar to claims 47, 48, 49, 59, and 66, claim 11 requires a means for producing a list of telephone numbers *in response to* called party information, as well as a means for receiving called party information. As described above, Yablon fails to disclose or suggest these features. The additionally cited reference -- Walsh -- similarly fails to disclose or suggest these features. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the obviousness rejection of claim 11 -- and any narrower claims depending therefrom -- cannot properly be maintained.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: July 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph E. Topmiller

Registration No.: 50,580

COVINGTON & BURLING

1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004-2401

(202) 662-6000

Attorney for Applicant